

EXHIBIT B

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2 FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY

3

 CIVIL ACTION NUMBER:
4 IN RE: VALSARTAN PRODUCTS 1:19-md-02875-RBK-JS
5 LIABILITY LITIGATION
6

 STATUS CONFERENCE

7 Pages 1 - 61
8 Mitchell H. Cohen Building & U.S. Courthouse
9 4th & Cooper Streets
10 Camden, New Jersey 08101
11 Wednesday, June 26, 2019
12 Commencing at 10:15 a.m.

13 B E F O R E: THE HONORABLE JOEL SCHNEIDER,
14 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

15 A P P E A R A N C E S:

16 LEVIN PAPANTONIO
17 BY: DANIEL A. NIGH, ESQUIRE
18 316 S. Baylen, Suite 600
19 Pennsacola, Florida 32502
20 For the Plaintiff

21 GOLOMB & HONIK PC
22 BY: RUBEN HONIK, ESQUIRE
23 DAVID JOHN STANOCH, ESQUIRE
24 1835 Market Street, Suite 2900
25 Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103
For the Plaintiff

KANNER & WHITELEY LLC
BY: CONLEE S. WHITELEY, ESQ.
701 Camp Street
New Orleans, Louisiana 70130
For the Plaintiff

Karen Friedlander, Official Court Reporter
friedlanderreporter@gmail.com
(856) 756-0160

Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography;
transcript produced by computer-aided transcription.

1 be, you know, one meeting, the API manufacturers would be a
2 different meeting. And to the extent there's some overlap in
3 a single supply chain, you know, that could also be another
4 way of breaking it up.

5 THE COURT: Okay. I thought -- we thought that that
6 was one of the reasons we did the core discovery early because
7 once you got those documents, that would help you frame the
8 discovery you request in this case, it would give you a head
9 start on identifying the appropriate custodians.

10 So your meetings with the defendants would likely
11 take place after the core discovery is produced, right?

12 MR. PAREKH: Correct, that would be the suggestion.

13 THE COURT: Right. So if we had a -- let's just
14 ballpark a time frame and maybe a target about where we're
15 headed in the case. When -- let's see. According to -- the
16 supplemental -- let's see. The supplemental insurance
17 disclosures are due in mid-July. I think, am I right, the
18 supplemental core discovery is the end of July?

19 MR. GOLDBERG: Mid-July.

20 THE COURT: Mid-July. Okay. So August to meet and
21 confer with the defendants about this?

22 MR. PAREKH: We need to get a handle on the volume of
23 documents that's going to be produced in core discovery and
24 until we -- we're going to get a large number of them actually
25 this Friday, I believe, and then once we see the volume and

1 the type of documents and what's in there, we'll have a better
2 idea. But I think targeting the end of August for a meeting
3 would make the most sense to give us enough time to actually
4 absorb what's in those documents.

5 MR. GOLDBERG: Your Honor, it seems like we're
6 missing a step. I mean, I think we would expect there to be
7 document requests served, Interrogatories served, based on --

8 THE COURT: No Interrogatories. We do the fact
9 sheets.

10 MR. GOLDBERG: Okay, that's fine. But document
11 requests served so that we can then have these discussions in
12 the context of those requests.

13 THE COURT: What do you think, plaintiffs? This is
14 important. Now pretty soon we're going to be finished with
15 the organization, we're doing a great job getting all that
16 done. Now this is the meat and potatoes of the case. So what
17 do you think about that?

18 MR. PAREKH: We think serving formal document
19 requests is fine. We're happy to do that. It was just sort
20 of saying what happened in Benicar was that they got served,
21 they got answered and then they got put aside.

22 THE COURT: I'm sorry, say that again, they got
23 served --

24 MR. PAREKH: There was a formal written response.

25 THE COURT: Yeah, they object.